

I think one way that Congress can distinguish this occasion and make it a special day is this week or next to pass H.R. 2030, a bill called parental choice in television. This bill gives parents a very simple power, the power to stop their children from watching TV shows that they think are too violent or too vulgar. Nationwide 72 percent of the people, when polled recently, said there is too much violence on TV.

An even larger number said they think that this violence shows up again as violence on the streets and violence in the schools.

Our bills will give parents a device to block violence and sex from coming into their homes by TV. When parents have this device built into their own TV sets, I think the networks are going to take note. I think they are going to be a lot more careful about the violence and vulgarity that they script into today's programs. All sorts of groups that care about children, from the PTA, to the elementary school principals, from psychiatrists to pediatricians have endorsed our bill. I urge the Committee on Rules to do the same and allow us the opportunity to offer it as an amendment to the telecommunications bill when it comes up in the House.

#### KOREAN WAR MEMORIAL

(Mr. MONTGOMERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, this Thursday at 3 in the afternoon at The Mall in front of the Lincoln Memorial, we will dedicate the Korean Memorial that honors those veterans who fought and were called to active duty during the Korean war. This, Mr. Speaker, is a very attractive memorial that will attract thousands and thousands of Americans to come and look at that war memorial that is dedicated to the Korean veterans and to those who went to Korea.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say about 30 Members of the House participated in the Korean war. I was one of them. So it is a pleasure to announce that this memorial will be dedicated this Thursday.

#### ECONOMIC RECOVERY AT THE EXPENSE OF WORKERS

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, Business Week Reports that corporate profits are at a 50-year high. They say that executives who average over \$1 million a year in pay and bonuses have caused this great profit by in fact cutting the wages of American workers and many times replacing full-time American workers with temporary hires.

You see, to many corporations, I believe, the best American workers is an American worker that also happens to

qualify for food stamps. Now, experts are saying this is the greatest economic recovery in our history. If that is so, I say right on the floor, these economic experts have been inhaling for a long time.

#### THE V CHIP

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Committee on Rules would make in order the Spratt-Markey-Moran-Burton amendment dealing with the V chip, which is the ability to provide parents greater say over what programs come into their home and to have the ability to lock those programs out should they desire that their children not be able to view those programs.

Many in the telecommunications industry and certainly many in the networks fought this effort when it was offered on the floor of the Senate and were able to defeat it. We should empower parents to have the say, to have this control in their own home about the kind of programming that is coming into their programs, especially when so very often young children are left at home or are home for a good portion of the day while both parents are out working.

Those parents should have the confidence that they can have some say to regulate the flow of programming, if they are concerned about violence, if they are concerned about sexual content of programs, they should have some say in that. They should be able to pick and choose for their children, not the networks and apparently not the sponsors that are not prepared to exercise self-control and to respect the rights of young children and of families.

I hope that the Committee on Rules would make the amendment in order and Members of the House would vote for the V chip amendment.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, 27 years ago, on July 3, 1968, my predecessor in Congress, the late James Howard, spoke eloquently on this floor in honor of the second anniversary of the Medicare Program. Medicare was enacted during Congressman Howard's first term in Congress. I know he looked

upon this opportunity to be part of that Medicare debate as a great honor.

I just wanted to quote something that he said in the RECORD on that day in 1968. He said:

As we celebrate the second anniversary of Medicare, we are really celebrating the enrichment of many lives, the elderly who are already served by Medicare, those who will be served in the coming years and the rest of us whose lives are enriched daily as we watch our elders lead more productive lives.

Now, I would like to compare what Jim Howard expressed so eloquently to what the Republican leadership of today is saying about Medicare.

According to one of the Republican leaders recently, "Medicare is a program I would have no part in the free world. Medicare," he said, "teaches seniors the lessons of dependence."

Mr. Speaker, the differences between Congressman Howard's statements and those Republican statements and the differences in the philosophies underlying them could not possibly be more stark. On the one hand you have Congressman Howard, a man of great compassion, expressing what most Americans believed then and still believe now, that Medicare is a hugely successful program which have been responsible for dramatically enhancing the quality of life of senior citizens and that this, in turn, has enriched the lives of all Americans, young and old.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, you have the Republican leadership of the 104th Congress tearing down Medicare as somehow unAmerican and implying that senior citizens should be ashamed of themselves for using their hard-earned Medicare benefits to pay for their health care, that participating in Medicare is somehow learning the lessons of dependence.

Of course, none of this is at all surprising. It is exactly what congressional Republicans have been saying about Medicare since it was started. After all, the congressional Republicans of today are indeed the direct ideological descendants of the party that did everything it could to prevent Medicare from ever being enacted.

Next week, we will be marking another anniversary, the 30th anniversary of the House passage of the Medicare Program. Unfortunately, unlike when Jim Howard came to the floor 27 years ago, this anniversary is not an occasion for celebration. Rather, it is a time to rally against yet another wrong-headed Republican attack on Medicare.

So far the Republican side has tried very hard to keep the specifics of their plans to change Medicare a secret from the American people. Who can blame them when you consider that the vast majority of Americans are against them. But last week we noticed in the papers that Senator GREGG of New Hampshire announced legislation with the goal of replacing Medicare coverage with a voucher program.

Mr. Speaker, a voucher system, no matter how you cloak it, amounts to

turning back the clock 30 years and abrogating the contract Congress made with America's seniors. Republican proposals to implement a voucher system are motivated exclusively by their desire to reduce the Federal budget by \$270 billion at senior citizen's expense. The amount the voucher provides will not likely be based on the cost of a quality health care plan but, rather, what level of funding is politically acceptable in a given fiscal year.

The Federal Government would, in effect, be walking away from Medicare and saying to seniors, Here is what we can afford; you make up the difference and fend for yourselves.

Since the overwhelming majority of seniors live on fixed incomes, they will not be able to pay more. Most would be forced to buy inadequate coverage. Some may not be able to find any health insurance and, rather than having choice, as Republicans claim, seniors would struggle in an increasingly expensive insurance market to buy diminished coverage with limited funds.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read from a statement that a senior citizen named Arthur Martin submitted to the Committee on Ways and Means on November 20, 1963. It poignantly conveys just why Medicare was needed then and why we need it today.

Mr. Martin said that his total income is his Social Security check of \$174, out of which he pays rent, utilities, food, et cetera. Three years ago, he said, he contracted bronchial asthma and was hospitalized five different times. The only remedy he had available was charity.

The stigma and indignity to self-respect to a resident of 50 years in the same community leading a respectable life as a taxpayer and in the evening of his life having to resort to charity was unbearable and humiliating. Whatever savings he had were wiped out in hospital and medical care.

Mr. Speaker, unless these Republican plans are stopped in their tracks, we are going to turn back the clock and create another generation of seniors who face the same indignity and pain that Mr. Martin endured 30 years ago, before we had Medicare. That would truly be an American tragedy, which I think that we in this Congress have to stop.

#### AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, this week—yesterday—I did a tour of the American Printing House for the Blind. Let me restate that name: the American Printing House for the Blind. It is in the center of the United States of America, and it happens to be in Louisville, KY, in my district. This is where services for the blind are generated in terms of printing.

The American Printing House for the Blind produces such works as this geography of the United States printed in Braille. What we see here is the only page that is printed in ink, in fact, because this is a supplement for a geography book.

What you will see from here on in, and I do not believe the camera will be able to pick this up, because it is Braille, there might be a little, there might be an ability on the camera to see some of these bumps. This is Braille. This is printed in very short runs, very limited editions for those people in our country who cannot study because of their eyesight.

□ 1220

That is people who are totally blind or in some other way are legally blind.

The reason I bring this up, Mr. Speaker, is that in the budget that is being marked up in the Committee on Appropriations right now; there is a 40-percent cut in the Federal expenditure at the American Printing House for the Blind in Louisville. That 40 percent is only \$2 million, \$2 million, which will not have the effect of balancing our Federal budget. It does not even represent one-thousandth of 1 percent of the tax cut that is being included in this next Federal budget, not even one-thousandth of 1 percent.

However, what it does to the American Printing House for the Blind in Louisville and the impact it has all over this country can be devastating. That is because there is no other supply for these kinds of materials. This is an American history book. As Members can see, it seems awfully big. In fact, it is just one of four volumes that are needed because of the large print. These are reprinted directly off of a standard American history textbook, but done in huge print for those who have some sight to be able to study. They are done in very limited runs.

There is no commercial alternative for either of these kinds of volumes. What we will see is a reduction by 40 percent if this budget cut goes through in the actual services, these actual kinds of materials, that are to be used by our blind children in this country.

We are talking about \$107 a year that is set aside for each legally blind child in America, up to college age, not including college age, high school or less, \$107 that is currently available to be spent by their school all over the country at the American Printing House for the Blind.

A 40-percent reduction, Mr. Speaker, would be unthinkable. A 40-percent reduction would do exactly what we are talking about up here not doing, because what we have been hearing for the last 6 months, and what we are all committed to, is helping people to help themselves, putting people in a position to get along a little better, to be able to do a little better for themselves and provide for themselves a little better. However, if we reduce by 40 percent the amount of school materials that

young blind people in this country can have to enhance their studies and continue their studies, we will be making it harder for them to take care of themselves as time goes by.

I ask the Members of the Congress to join me in restoring this 40 percent to the American Printing House for the Blind and make sure that all of our blind children in America have the opportunity to learn and then later to earn.

#### TOBACCO AND AMERICA'S YOUTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have taken out this special order to talk about the No. 1 threat to the health of our children—tobacco.

This week, data from the National Institute on Drug Abuse shows that we are losing the battle to keep cigarettes away from children. In just 3 years, there has been a 30-percent increase in smoking among 13- and 14-year-olds. Nearly one-third of high school seniors smoke cigarettes.

This is a health crisis of huge dimensions. Every day, 3,000 children start smoking. One-third of these children will eventually die from their tobacco addiction.

Why is this happening? The answer is obvious. The tobacco industry spends \$5 billion a year—over \$10 million a day—on tobacco advertising and promotion. Much of this effort is specifically targeted at children. To keep its profits flowing, the industry has developed clever promotions like Joe Camel and the Marlboro Country Store aimed directly at children.

The administration is trying to protect our children from tobacco. As reported last week, FDA Commissioner David Kessler has found that tobacco is an addictive drug. He has called for commonsense regulation to protect children—like banning cigarette vending machines. I believe the President will support these efforts.

Unfortunately, when word of the administration's actions leaked out, it encountered fierce resistance on Capitol Hill. The Speaker said that Commissioner Kessler must be "out of his mind" to consider regulating tobacco. Other Members promised Congress would intervene to prevent regulation from going forward.

It is against this backdrop that I am here today. This hour, I will be reading into the RECORD excerpts of dozens of previously secret documents from the Nation's largest tobacco company, Philip Morris. These documents make a compelling case for regulation of tobacco to protect children. I hope they will dissuade Members of this body from any legislative effort to block regulation.

Last year, when I served as chairman of the Health and the Environment